Attorney Docket No. P28993 Application No.: 10/561,041

- SEO ID No. 7
- SEO ID No. 9
- SEQ ID No. 11
- SEO ID No. 13

ELECTION

In order to be responsive to the requirement for restriction, Applicants elect, with traverse, the species SEQ ID NO: 5. At least claims 3, 9, 18, and 19 are readable on the elected species.

TRAVERSE

Notwithstanding the election of the species SEQ ID NO: 5, in order to be responsive to the restriction requirement for election of species, Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction.

Applicants note that this application is a national stage application, and therefore under unity of invention practice the Examiner must establish that the claims lack unity of invention under PCT Rule 13.1 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.475. In the instant situation, the requirement is improperly silent with respect to any supporting basis in PCT Rule 1.474. Therefore, the Restriction Requirement is improper for not discussing the various sections of PCT Rule 1.475, and applying these rules to the pending claims.

Moreover, Applicants note that SEQ ID NO: 5 and SEQ ID NO: 7 differ in only one amino acid, resulting in a homology of 99.5%. Also, the homology between SEQ ID NO: 3 and SEQ ID NO: 5 is 87.9%. Applicants further note that SEQ ID NOS: 3, 5, and 7 are all proteins derived from the same species, i.e., *Acropora sp.*

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the election requirement and, at least, consider SEQ ID NOS 3, 5, and 7 together.

If there are any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted, Atsushi MIYAWAKI et al.

Bruce H Bernstein

Reg. No. 29,027

September 17, 2009 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 Roland Clarke Place Reston, VA 20191 (703) 716-1191